

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 3, 2009, Claims 1-6, 10-16, 20-26 and 30-39 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 33, 36 and 39 were objected to because of various informalities. Claims 32, 35 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 11-13, 20 and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 7,039,923) in view of Allamaraju (Allamaraju et al., "Professional Java Server Programming J2EE," 1.3.edition). Claims 1-6, 10, 14-16, 21-26, 30-33 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar, in view of Allamaraju, and further in view of Susarla (U.S. Patent No. 6,915,511).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 4, 11, 21 and 31-39, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6, 10-16, 20-26 and 30-39.

III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, Claims 33, 36 and 39 were objected to because of various informalities. Accordingly, the claims have been amended as shown above to correct the informalities. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, Claims 32, 35, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the claims have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, Claims 11-13, 20 and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 7,039,923, hereinafter Kumar) in view of

Allamaraju (Allamaraju et al., "Professional Java Server Programming J2EE," 1.3.edition, hereinafter Allamaraju).

Claim 11

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 11 for at least the reasons provided below. To expedite prosecution, Claim 11 has also been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein as:

1. *(Currently Amended) A system for loading Enterprise Java Bean software application components in an application server, the system comprising:
a computer including one or more microprocessors;
an application server for executing an Enterprise Java Bean software application thereupon, wherein said Enterprise Java Bean software application has a plurality of modules and classes associated therewith;
an application configuration file associated with said Enterprise Java Bean software application, wherein said configuration file includes a tag layout and application classloader structure elements that determine a hierarchy of modules and classes of the Enterprise Java Bean software application to be loaded into the application server, and that define a namespace separation between different modules and classes; and
a deployment logic that
parses the configuration file,
recognizes the modules and classes specified therein, and
retrieves those modules and classes from a computer readable medium
in a manner consistent with the tag layout in the configuration file,
wherein upon receiving a request to load some or all of the modules and classes of the Enterprise Java Bean software application, the system constructs an application container at the application server with the classes and modules, in the order in which the classes and modules were retrieved, to create a hierarchy of classloaders consistent with the tag layout, and to maintain the namespace separation between the different modules and classes.*

Claim 11, as amended, defines an application configuration file that includes a tag layout and application classloader structure elements that determine a hierarchy of modules and classes of an Enterprise Java Bean software application to be loaded into the application server, and that define a namespace separation between different modules and classes. Claim 11 further defines that, upon receiving a request to load some or all of the modules and classes of the Enterprise Java Bean software application, the system constructs an application container at the application server with the classes and modules, in the order in which the classes and

modules were retrieved, to create a hierarchy of classloaders consistent with the tag layout, and to maintain the namespace separation between the different modules and classes.

In the Office Action it was acknowledged that Kumar does not explicitly disclose an application configuration file that includes a tag layout and application classloader structure elements that determine the hierarchy of modules and classes of the software application to be loaded in the application server. However, it was asserted that Allamaraju discloses using a deployment descriptor file; constructing an application container at the application server with the classes and modules, in the order in which the classes and modules were retrieved; and that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the application container at the application server at run time as required by the J2EE specification. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion in view of the following remarks.

Allamaraju appears to disclose J2EE packaging and deployment, including the use of an application.xml deployment descriptor which requires tags. Examples of tags therein include that each J2EE module included in the enterprise application must have an equivalent <module> tag describing the module, EJBs are described using the <ejb> tag, and web applications are described using the <web> tag. (Page 12, "Working with the EAR Deployment Descriptor"). Allamaraju also appears to disclose that most application servers deploy EAR files using the same approach, namely: 1. All resource adapters contained within the EAR file will be deployed into the connector infrastructure; 2. All EJB modules will be deployed; and 3. All web application modules will be deployed. (Pages 17-18, "Issues with the Ordering of Modules").

Applicant respectfully submits that, although Allamaraju appears to disclose a configuration file that includes tags, neither Allamaraju nor Kumar appear to disclose or render obvious the use of a configuration file that includes a tag layout and application classloader structure elements, such that the configuration file is then used to determine a hierarchy of modules and classes to be loaded into the application server. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Kumar nor Allamaraju appear to disclose or render obvious an application configuration file that includes a *tag layout and application classloader structure elements that determine a hierarchy of modules and classes of the software application*, and that *define a namespace separation between different modules and classes*.

Applicant further respectfully submits that neither Kumar nor Allamaraju appear to disclose or render obvious a deployment logic that parses the configuration file, recognizes the modules and classes specified therein, and retrieves those modules and classes from a computer readable medium in a manner consistent with the tag layout in the configuration file,

wherein upon receiving a request to load some or all of the modules and classes of the software application, the system constructs an application container at the application server with the classes and modules, in the order in which the classes and modules were retrieved, *to create a hierarchy of classloaders consistent with the tag layout, and to maintain the namespace separation between the different modules and classes.* Claim 11 has been amended as shown above to more clearly define these features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-13, 20 and 34-36

Claims 12-13, 20 and 34-36 depend from and include all of the features of Claim 11. Claims 12-13, 20 and 34-36 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 10, 14-16, 21-26, 30-33 and 37-39

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 10, 14-16, 21-26, 30-33 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar, in view of Allamaraju, and further in view of Susarla (U.S. Patent No. 6,915,511, hereinafter Susarla).

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 11 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 1 and 21 are, respectively, a system claim and a computer readable medium claim which have similar features to Claim 11, as described above. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 21, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 10, 14-16, 22-26, 30-33 and 37-39 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 11 or 21, as described above. Claims 2-6, 10, 14-16, 22-26, 30-33 and 37-39 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes no additional fee is required with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 3, 2009

By: /Karl Kenna/
Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800